



Texas Department of Insurance

Division of Workers' Compensation

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48

7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1645

512-804-4000 telephone • 512-804-4811 fax • www.tdi.texas.gov

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name and Address

PLANO REHABILITATION HOSPITAL
2800 W 15TH ST
PLANO TX 75075-7526

Respondent Name

TEXAS MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY

Carrier's Austin Representative Box

Box Number 54

MFDR Tracking Number

M4-98-0219-01

MFDR Date Received

July 7, 1997

REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary: "Claims were submitted to the Fund for dates of service or equipment which had never been paid or considered for payment by any payer involved. They have been bounced back and forth by United Healthcare as a work comp case and by the Fund which appears to consider payment received as 'fair and reasonable' . . . From the Fund we received two notifications. One dealt with their position on payment due to litigation for acute care fee guidelines and that providers would need to resort to medical dispute resolution for additional reimbursement. The second notice stated that this was a third party settlement and that we had received an amount of \$56,105.43 from United Healthcare. Numerous telephone conversations with staff at the Fund has not resolved this issue. . . . The specific services have not been paid and were necessary for the care, safety and wellbeing of the patient. Please consider this request for medical dispute resolution."

Amount in Dispute: \$28,818.68

RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary: "the Fund has already paid Petitioner all moneys due under the statutory standard for payment established by §413.11, Tex. Labor Code. . . . Petitioner has the burden of proof of establishing that the fee payments already made by the Fund fall short of the statutory standards . . . independent evidence establishes that the payment method used by the Fund provides payments to hospitals that equaled or exceeded the payment levels set in the statutory standard."

Response Submitted by: Texas Workers' Compensation Insurance Fund, 221 West 6th Street, Suite 300, Austin, Texas 78701-3403

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Date(s) of Service	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
October 24, 1996 to October 31, 1996	Inpatient Rehabilitation Hospital Services	\$28,818.68	\$0.00

FINDINGS AND DECISION

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and all applicable, adopted rules of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation.

Background

1. Former 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.305, effective June 3, 1991, 16 *Texas Register* 2830, sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes.
2. Former 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1(f) effective October 7, 1991, 16 *Texas Register* 5210, sets out the reimbursement guidelines for the services in dispute.
3. Texas Labor Code §413.011 sets forth provisions regarding reimbursement policies and guidelines.
4. The services in dispute were reduced/denied by the respondent with the following payment exception codes:
 - X – PAYMENT TO THIRD PARTY.
 - F – REIMBURSED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE TEXAS HOSPITAL INPATIENT FEE GUIDELINE STOP LOSS RATE.

Findings

1. The insurance carrier denied disputed services with reason code X – “PAYMENT TO THIRD PARTY.” Review of the submitted information finds no documentation to support this denial reason. The disputed services will therefore be reviewed per applicable Division rules and fee guidelines.
2. This dispute relates to inpatient rehabilitation hospital services. The former agency's *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline* at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.400, 17 *Texas Register* 4949, was declared invalid in the case of *Texas Hospital Association v. Texas Workers' Compensation Commission*, 911 *South Western Reporter Second* 884 (Texas Appeals – Austin, 1995, writ of error denied January 10, 1997). As no specific fee guideline existed for these disputed services during the time period the services were rendered, the 1991 version of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1(f) applies as the proper Division rule to address fee payment issues in this dispute, as confirmed by the Court's opinion in *All Saints Health System v. Texas Workers' Compensation Commission*, 125 *South Western Reporter Third* 96 (Texas Appeals – Austin, 2003, petition for review denied). 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1(f), effective October 7, 1991, 16 *Texas Register* 5210, requires that “Reimbursement for services not identified in an established fee guideline shall be reimbursed at fair and reasonable rates as described in the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, sec. 8.21(b), until such period that specific fee guidelines are established by the commission.”
3. The former Texas Workers' Compensation Act section 8.21 was repealed, effective September 1, 1993 by Acts 1993, 73rd Legislature, chapter 269, section 5(2). Therefore, for services rendered on or after September 1, 1993, the applicable statute is the former version of Texas Labor Code section 413.011(b), Acts 1993, 73rd Legislature, chapter 269, section 1, effective September 1, 1993, which states, in pertinent part, that “Guidelines for medical services fees must be fair and reasonable and designed to ensure the quality of medical care and to achieve effective medical cost control. The guidelines may not provide for payment of a fee in excess of the fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living and paid by that individual or by someone acting on that individual's behalf. The commission shall consider the increased security of payment afforded by this subtitle.”
4. Review of the submitted documentation finds that:
 - The requestor has not articulated a methodology under which fair and reasonable reimbursement should be calculated.
 - The Division finds that a reimbursement methodology based upon payment of a hospital's billed charges does not produce an acceptable payment amount. Such a reimbursement methodology would leave the ultimate reimbursement in the control of the hospital, thus defeating the statutory objective of effective cost control and the statutory standard not to pay more than for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living. It also provides no incentive to contain medical costs. Therefore, a reimbursement amount that is calculated based upon a percentage of a hospital's billed charges cannot be favorably considered when no other data or documentation was submitted to support that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services in dispute.
 - The requestor does not discuss or explain how payment of the amount sought would result in a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services in this dispute.
 - The requestor did not submit documentation to support that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the disputed services.
 - The requestor does not discuss or explain how payment of the requested amount would satisfy the requirements of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1.
5. The request for additional reimbursement is not supported. Thorough review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not demonstrated or justified that payment of the amount sought would be a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in dispute. Additional payment cannot be recommended.

Conclusion

The Division would like to emphasize that individual medical fee dispute outcomes rely upon the evidence presented by the requestor and respondent during dispute resolution. After thorough review and consideration of the evidence presented by the parties to this dispute, it is determined that the submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The requestor has failed to establish that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$0.00.

ORDER

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the requestor is entitled to \$0.00 reimbursement for the disputed services.

Authorized Signature

_____	<u>Grayson Richardson</u>	<u>January 16, 2014</u>
Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer	Date

YOUR RIGHT TO APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute may appeal this decision by requesting a contested case hearing. A completed **Request for a Medical Contested Case Hearing** (form **DWC045A**) must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **twenty** days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. The party seeking review of the MDR decision shall deliver a copy of the request for a hearing to all other parties involved in the dispute at the same time the request is filed with the Division. **Please include a copy of the *Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision*** together with any other required information specified in 28 Texas Administrative Code §148.3(c), including a **certificate of service demonstrating that the request has been sent to the other party**.

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.